26th August 1925]

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the supply from the sluice does not now reach the Palayakayal tank owing to the gradual conversion of dry lands into wet to the extent of 550 acres between Iruvappapuram—Kumarapuram;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the Palayakayal tank has now to depend solely on the scanty supply available from the Arumugamangalam tank surplus, which has a direct irrigation of about 350 acres and which also scarcely reaches the Palayakayal tank; and

(*e*) whether it is a fact that this source is both precarious and unsatisfactory on account of its faulty situation?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The registered source of supply to the tank is sluice No. 4 of the Peikulam tank under the North main channel of the Srivaikuntam anicut system. No information is available about the alleged contribution from the ryots in 1869.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) & (*e*) The tank now gets its supply from the Arumugamangalam tank surplus; the question whether further improvements are necessary has been referred to the Chief Engineer as stated in the answer to question No. 242.

Remission of land revenue on lands under Palayakayal tank.

* 403 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur CRUZ FERNANDEZ: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the lands under the Palayakayal tank have suffered periodically for want of sufficient supply of water and that, in consequence, Government have been granting remission of land revenue, year after year, on account of failure or poor outturn of crops;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that a conference of the ryots was held at Iruvappapuram on the 18th May 1925 under the direction of the Sub-Collector, Tuticorin;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that at that conference it was proposed by the Sub-Collector that a separate supply channel should be provided from sluice No. 1 of Peikulam tank to ensure a regular and sufficient supply to Palayakayal tank and that the ryots have agreed to bear 20 per cent of the cost of the proposed new supply channel; and

(*d*) what steps have been taken by Government to carry out or investigate the above proposal?

A.—The Government have no detailed information on the points raised; but as stated in their answer to question No. 242 they have received a petition in which reference is made to the meeting with Sub-Collector and the proposals made at it, and they have referred the matter to the Chief Engineer.

Irrigation in Nellore district.

* 404 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that during the investigations of the Irrigation Commission, 1901–03, Nellore district was included in the famine zone of the Presidency along with the Ceded districts?

A.—Nellore was included amongst the districts 'more or less liable to famine,' but was differentiated from the Ceded districts which were considered to be the 'most insecure'.

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu :—"In view of the answer given to the succeeding question No. 407, may I ask the hon. the Law Member whether he will take steps to see that the interests of Nellore district will not be overlooked? I am putting this supplementary question because the answer given in the succeeding question is rather discouraging."

The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar :—"In answer to that question, I may say that the hon. Member from Nellore did me the honour of sending a memorandum on the possibility of development of the irrigation projects in the Nellore district which I have forwarded to the Irrigation Committee and they will have to consider it. I believe, judging from what I have informally learnt from the President of that Committee, that there are two alternative proposals, one of which will include Nellore in the scheme of development of irrigation projects."

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu :—"That is the very point to which I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. the Law Member and that is why I asked him whether in view of the very discouraging answer given in the succeeding question, he would not take steps to safeguard the interests of the Nellore district."

The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar :—"It is earnestly hoped that the Irrigation Committee will not also discourage the hon. Member from Nellore."

Tungabhadra project.

* 405 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu : With reference to the answer given to question No. 379 put by me at the meeting held on the 21st August 1924, that the Tungabhadra project is being examined and revised and that it provides for about 340,000 acres of first crop and 60,000 acres of second crop in the Nellore district, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state if the revision of the project is in any way calculated to affect the provision made in the original estimate for the extension and improvement of irrigation in the Nellore district?

A.—The project as revised in 1924 was found to be financially impossible; and an alternative with a reservoir at a higher site is under consideration. Until this has been investigated further by a special staff it is impossible to say how it will compare with the original scheme so far as concerns Nellore.

Sangameswaram project.

* 406 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state the progress made in the investigations and negotiations made in regard to the Sangameswaram project?

A.—The Government are still engaged in considering the question of transfer of territory in compensation for the land that will be submerged in Hyderabad.